## REMARKS

The following is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed on

February 4, 2004 having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 4, 2004.

Claims 1-20 were examined. The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as

anticipated by Merrill. In response, Applicant has amended certain claims, claims 4 and 15 have

been cancelled, and claims 21 and 22 have been added. Reconsideration of the pending claims is

respectfully requested for reasons presented below.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On page 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by

the method for detecting that a statement described in published U.S. Patent Application,

"Method and System for Synchronizing Scripted Animations," U.S. Publication 62002/0008703

A1, 1/2002, applied for by Merrill et al. In response, Applicant is amending claim 1 and, as the

rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 as amended includes the limitation of original dependent claim 4, replacing

"objects" with "graphical components." Furthermore, amended claim 1 recites the limitations of

(i) performing said operation (specified by an operation identifier) on said attribute of each

graphical component in said set of graphical components that satisfy said pattern matching

criteria, and (ii) altering state information corresponding to each graphical component in said set

of graphical components to generate a frame within an animation. Merrill does not teach these

limitations. Rather, Merrill teaches that the operation identifier (i.e. agent object) includes a

number of functions to control the playback of an animation rather than to generate a frame

within an animation. Furthermore, Merrill discloses that sets of graphical components (i.e.,

270318_1                                        8

bitmaps) are maintained and a particular bitmap within a set of graphical components is selected based on the position of a character for purposes of synchronizing speech output, rather than altering state information corresponding to each bitmap within the set of graphical components for purposes of frame generation. Nowhere does Merrill disclose using an agent object to alter state information corresponding to each graphical component in a set of graphical components that satisfy said pattern matching criteria to generate a frame within an animation. Merrill therefore fails to teach each and every one of the recited steps of amended claim 1, and this failure precludes Merrill from anticipating amended claim 1. For these reasons, Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 1.

On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-7 as being anticipated by Merrill. Amended claim 1 includes the limitations of dependent claim 4. Applicant therefore withdraws claim 4. Original claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and amended claim 6 depend from allowable amended claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of original claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and amended claim 6 and allowance of those claims.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 8 as being anticipated by the method for identifying an attribute of a member of a collection of objects (pp. 23, Para 419) and the method for detecting that a statement contains an operation identifier, pattern-matching criteria, and attribute identifier, and executing the statement by identifying all objects associated with identifiers that satisfy pattern matching criteria, performing the operation on the objects described in Merrill. In response, Applicant is amending claim 8 and, as the rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverses.

270318_1                                   9

Similarly to amended claim 1, amended claim 8 recites the limitations of (i) performing said operation on said attribute of each graphical component in said identified member graphical components, and (ii) altering state information corresponding to each graphical component of said identified member graphical components to generate a frame within an animation. As explained with reference to claim 1, Merrill does not teach these limitations and therefore fails to teach each and every one of the recited steps of amended claim 8. This failure precludes Merrill from anticipating amended claim 8. For these reasons, Applicant submits that amended claim 8 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 8.

On pages 5-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-11 as being anticipated by Merrill. Amended claims 9 and 10 and original claim 11 depend from allowable amended claim 8 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 8. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended claims 9 and 10 and original claim 11 and allowance of those claims.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 12 as being anticipated by a computer-readable medium described on page 23, Para 420 of Merrill for performing the method of original claim 1. In response, Applicant is amending claim 12 and, as the rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverses.

Similarly to amended claim 1, amended claim 12 recites the limitations of (i) performing said operation on said attribute of each graphical component in said set of graphical components that satisfy said pattern matching criteria, and (ii) altering state information corresponding to each graphical component in said set of graphical components to generate a frame within an animation. As explained with reference to claim 1, Merrill does not teach these limitations and therefore fails to teach each and every one of the recited steps of amended claim 12. This failure

precludes <u>Merrill</u> from anticipating amended claim 12. For these reasons, Applicant submits that amended claim 12 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 12.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 13-17 as being anticipated by <u>Merrill</u>. Amended Claim 12 includes the limitations of dependent claim 15. Applicant therefore withdraws claim 15. Original claims 13, 14, 16 and amended claim 17 depend from allowable amended claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 12. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of original claims 13, 14, 16 and amended claim 17 and allowance of those claims.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 18 as being anticipated by as being anticipated by a computer-readable medium described on page 23, Para 420 of <u>Merrill</u> for performing the method of original claim 8. In response, Applicant is amending claim 18 and, as the rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverses.

Similarly to amended claim 8, amended claim 18 recites the limitations of (i) performing said operation on said attribute of each graphical component in said identified member graphical components, and (ii) altering state information corresponding to each graphical component of said identified member graphical components to generate a frame within an animation. As explained with reference to claim 1, <u>Merrill</u> does not teach this limitation and therefore fails to teach each and every one of the recited steps of amended claim 18. This failure precludes <u>Merrill</u> from anticipating amended claim 18. For these reasons, Applicant submits that amended claim 18 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of claim 18.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 19-20 as being anticipated by <u>Merrill</u>. Amended claims 19-20 depend from allowable amended claim 18 and are allowable

AUTO/0034

for at least the same reasons as amended claim 18. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended claims 19-20 and allowance of those claims.

### Claims 21-22

New claim 21 depends from allowable amended claim 1 and is allowable for at least the

same reasons as amended claim 1. New claim 22 depends from allowable amended claim 8 and

is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 8. Further, claims 21 and 22 are

supported by the specification (see, e.g., page 10 lines 18-24 and page 11 lines1-2). For these

reasons, Applicant requests allowance of claims 21-22.

### Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, Applicant believes that he has overcome all of the rejections

set forth in the Office Action mailed on February 4, 2004 and that the pending and new claims

are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicant's

undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Winner
Registration No. 52,371
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
350 Cambridge Ave., Suite 250
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Telephone: (650) 330-2310
Facsimile: (650) 330-2314

270318_1                                12